

**To:** Diamond, Jane[Diamond.Jane@epa.gov]; Johnson, Kathleen[Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov]  
**From:** Hanf, Lisa  
**Sent:** Wed 12/3/2014 1:22:36 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Yesterday's BDCP policy meeting and proposed agenda for tomorrow's update for Ken Kopocis and Cynthia Giles

Are there any further developments re: technical discussion (#2 below)? I just heard back from Kathy Goforth that Stephanie is swamped and recommended that Erin cover it the technical issues. I assume that would be OK with you, but am checking. I can contact Erin if that hasn't already been done. Does 10 minutes seem right? Let me know. Thanks.

Lisa B. Hanf, Assistant Director

Strategic Planning, Enforcement Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 9

(415) 972-3854

**From:** Diamond, Jane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 02, 2014 8:19 AM  
**To:** Johnson, Kathleen; Hanf, Lisa; Goforth, Kathleen; Skophammer, Stephanie; Foresman, Erin; Vendlinski, Tim; Kemmerer, John; Hagler, Tom  
**Subject:** Yesterday's BDCP policy meeting and proposed agenda for tomorrow's update for Ken Kopocis and Cynthia Giles

Below you'll see a very short summary of yesterday's BDCP policy committee meeting which Kathleen, Tom and I attended. With the State delays noted below and with the holidays coming up, our next policy-level check-in is scheduled as a call on January 15 at 10:00. In the meantime, Cassandra (who was present at the meeting) expects to provide meeting summaries and action items from the 3 technical meetings and continue to engage with us. Jim Moose and John Bezdek are preparing something written on the range of scenarios they are considering for the no action alternative. One thing Cassandra said she is waiting for from EPA is how we want to see the Rio Vista minimum flows reflected. She also said Erin, Tim and Stephanie are deciding how to handle the remaining topics under the Tech meeting 4 that weren't already discussed in one of the previous technical meetings. There was acknowledgment of the need to talk more about mercury and selenium and that we are waiting to see the other technical information and changes discussed at the meetings reflected in writing.

Please let me know what changes or additions you have for the following draft agenda for the Ken/Cynthia call tomorrow, which we'll do in Kathleen's office (NW corner of 19<sup>th</sup> floor):

- 1) Structure of recent discussions (principals meetings continue without EPA, structured policy and technical discussions with EPA) (Jane)
- 2) Key outcomes from policy and technical discussions held Oct. 29-Dec. 1 (Jane or Kathleen for policy; who for technical?)
- 3) Anticipated schedule (Kathleen)
- 4) Feinstein legislation—any intelligence from HQ?
- 5) Questions from OECA or OW?

Jane Diamond

Water Director, EPA Region 9

415-947-8707

**From:** Blumenfeld, Jared

**Sent:** Monday, December 01, 2014 10:17 PM

**To:** Diamond, Jane

**Cc:** Gaudario, Abigail; Ty, Fatima; Kao, Jessica; Johnson, Kathleen

**Subject:** Re: BDCP--today's policy meeting, and OW/OECA proposed Wed update--or should we ask OW to reschedule?

Let's keep Wednesday for you to brief Ken without me.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 1, 2014, at 5:07 PM, "Diamond, Jane" <[Diamond.Jane@epa.gov](mailto:Diamond.Jane@epa.gov)> wrote:

Hi Jared. Ken K asked for an update on BDCP in anticipation of CEQ discussion. His office scheduled a call for Wednesday at 12:30. The timing is good from the standpoint that Kathleen, Tom Hagler and I went to a policy meeting in Sacramento today with DWR, Governor's office, DOI, USFWS and NMFS. But Abi declined for you since you have multiple engagements in Sacramento on Wednesday.

Let us know if you'd like us to have OW reschedule the call to another day so you can participate. Otherwise, we will proceed and fill you in afterwards. Here's a short summary of today's meeting:

Today's discussion focused on the progress of technical discussions, which indicate that a very modest increase in outflows will allow water quality standards to be largely met at the current compliance point (not at their previously suggested compliance point further upstream). There has also been very good discussion and clarification of other technical issues, and some more discussion needed, but so far DWR/ICF have only shared via power points, so we're waiting to see some things in writing. In the short term, we are awaiting written meeting summaries, including action items, from DWR from 3 technical meetings held Nov. 10, 13 and 24. Beyond that, DWR is still figuring out exactly what they/ICF will produce in writing, a decision which won't be made till next year, and a schedule. They acknowledged having fallen at least 4-6 weeks behind their original timetable and said the earliest ICF could potentially produce the additional documents needed for the Supplemental is April. They understand we're not pressing a schedule.

Jane